DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 037 95 RC 008 065

AUTHOR Wax, Murray L.; Breunig, Robert G.
TITLE Study of the Community Impact of the Hopi Follow Through Program. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Kansas Univ., Lawrence. Dept. of Sociology.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-2-0647-FR
PUB DATE Oct 73
GRANT OEG-0-72-3946
NOTE 65p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *American Indians; Anglo Americans; Community Influence; Culture Conflict; Definitions; English (Second Language); *Interaction; *Parent Attitudes; *Parent Participation; Program Evaluation; *School Community Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Arizona; *Hopis; Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

The social and cultural distance between the schools serving American Indian children and their communities has been viewed as the source of many of the basic problems in Indian education. In 1968 the Hopi Indian Tribe of Arizona instituted a Follow Through Program to provide for such parental involvement in their schools' educational processes. This study looked at how Hopi parents defined formal education and the school and how that definition was affected by participation in the school program via Follow Through. Between 1970 and 1972 studies were made of Hopi attitudes toward formal education utilizing participant observations and semi-formal interviews. P. T. A. meetings, classrooms, teachers' and principals' meetings were observed. Using a standard questionnaire, 178 parents were interviewed. As a result of Hopi-Anglo interactions within the school context for the past 100 years, Hopi parents degined the schools as Anglo institutions where their children are sent to learn Anglo skills, especially English. Parental involvement via the Follow Through Program did not significantly change his definition because the program, designed and implemented from without the community, tended to reinforce and perpetuate the basic patterns of Anglo-Hopi interactions. (Author/NQ)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 096037

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: RC | PS
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

RECEIVED
SEP 30 1974
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Final Report

Project No. 2-0647
Grant No. OEG-O-72-3946

Murray L. Wax
Robert G. Dreunig

University of Kansas
Department of Sociology
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Study of the Community Impact of the Hopi Follow Through Program

October 1973

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
National Institute of Education

RC008065

Final Report

Project No. 2-0647

Grant No. OEG-0-72-3946

STUDY OF THE COMMUNITY IMPACT OF THE HOPI FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM

Murray L. Wax
Robert G. Breunig

University of Kansas
Department of Sociology
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

October 1973

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

National Institute of Education

ABSTRACT

Recent studies have noted the social and cultural distance between the schools serving American Indian children and the communities from which they come. This distance has been viewed as the source of many of the basic problems in the area of Indian education.

Several studies, and, most notably, that of Wax, Wax, and Dumont (1964) have suggested that the involvement of parents in the educational processes of the school might help overcome many of the educational problems in schools serving American Indians.

In 1968 the Hopi Indian Tribe of Arizona instituted a Follow Through Program designed to provide for such parental involvement in their schools. This study looked at how Hopi parents defined formal education and the institution of the school as well as how that definition was affected by the Hopi participation in the school program via Follow Through.

Between 1970 and 1972 studies were made of Hopi attitudes towards formal education utilizing the techniques of participant observation and semi-formal interviewing. P.T.A. meetings, classrooms, teachers, and principals' meetings were all observed. 178 parents were interviewed using a standard questionnaire.

It was found that as a result of Hopi-Anglo interactions within the school context for the past 100 years, Hopi parents tend to define the schools as Anglo institutions where their children are to be sent to learn Anglo skills, especially English. Parental involvement via the Follow Through Program did not significantly change their definition of the school because the program, designed and implemented from without the community, tended to reinforce and perpetuate the basic patterns of interactions between Anglos and Hopis within the school context as they existed over the past 100 years.

If the goal of the federal government of the United States is to stimulate community-controlled and community-oriented school programs, it is the authors' concluding opinions that new programs should derive from within the local communities themselves.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract 1

Table of Tables 3

Introduction 4

- Related Research 5
- The Hopi "Experiment" 6
- Defining Our Research 7

Methods and Procedures 10

Results I: How Hopi Parents View The Schools Today (1973) 12

- What School Should Teach 12
- Comment 18
- Those Who Favor Hopi Culture in the Schools 20
- What the Schools are Expected to Do 22
- The Question of English 24
- Who Should Make Educational Decisions 28

Results II: The Hopi Follow Through Program..... 32

- The Behavior Analysis Model 32
- How Parents Feel About Follow Through 36
- Community Understanding of the Follow Through Program 44
- Frontiers and Definitions 47
- Community Involvement in the Schools 49

Conclusions 52

Recommendations 56

Bibliography 57

TABLE OF TABLES

1. "What Do Hopi Children Need to be Taught the Most?" ..... page 15.

2. "Who Should Make Decisions On What the School Teaches Your Child?"..... page 29.

3. "Are There Any Parts of the Follow Through Program That You Like?" ..... page 37.

4. "Are There Any Parts of the Follow Through Program That You Dislike?"..... page 38.

5. "Do You Know What the Follow Through Program Is?" or "Do You Understand What It Is About?" ..... page 45.

6. "Do You Know What the P.A.C. Is?"..... page 51.

INTRODUCTION

On March 30, 1968, the Vice Chairman of the Hopi Tribal Council, addressed the United States Senate's Special Subcommittee on Indian Education. He told the committee of the historical interest that the Hopi had in their education. He called self-help and self-determination "the most fundamental desire of the Hopi people in all educational undertakings." He spoke of their "desire to help direct the B.I.A. (Bureau of Indian Affairs) school operation" and listed eight requests concerning education. Among them were these:

a. "A preschool program to give Hopi children a headstart..."

b. The establishment of school boards for all schools and a training program to enable its members to effectively carry out their responsibilities.

c. The participation of the teachers on the reservation "in civic activities to the same extent as elsewhere."

d. "Administrative responsibility and authority should become more localized into tribal groups so that the educational program may be more receptive to the special needs and ability at such local level."

e. A "positive program to constantly improve the efficiency of teachers, administrators, and methods."

In conclusion he added:

> "The end to which we aspire is no longer just the training of doctors, lawyers, engineers, and teachers, but the end must be the training of citizens in two cultures, affluent in both and the worthy contributors to each." (Hearings of the Senate's Special Subcommittee on Indian Education 1968: 1004-1005)

These Hearings were evidence of a changing national attitude about Indian communities and the programs that served them, especially in education. Statistics had shown an Indian "drop-out" rate which was twice the national average

and achievement levels two or three years behind the national average. In addition, only 1% of the Indian schools had Indian teachers or principals. In the early 1960's studies of Indian communities pointed out a social and cultural gap between the children in the schools and those who ran the schools (Report of the United States Senate Special Subcommittee on Indian Education 1969: iv).

Related Research

Previous studies of the problems of Indian education had cited the mutual isolation---social, cultural, and often physical---of the schools serving Indian children from the communities of those children. Particularly notable were the studies of King (1967), Wolcott (1967), and Wax, Wax, and Dumont (1964).

> Isolation--lack of communication, social distance--is the cardinal factor in the problem of Indian education on the Pine Ridge Reservation. Because the isolation affects so many contexts--the community as a whole, the school within the community, the pupil within the classroom, and the teacher within the educational system--its effect is greatly intensified.
>
> ...Rarely do parents visit the schools and their classrooms. In turn, teachers rarely leave the school campus and the paved roads to observe any aspect of Sioux life. As a result, parents do not understand what their children should be doing or learning in school, and, even when they wish to help their children obtain an education, they do not know what they might do to assist them. Conversely, most teachers know little about Sioux life, and what little they know tends to repel them; thus they find it hard to reach out to their pupils. (Wax, Wax, and Dumont 1964: 102)

To overcome the problems created by the social and cultural distance between the schools and Indian communities, critics and reformers had recommended that parents be allowed maximum participation and control in the schools serving their children. The Waxes and Dumont concluded their study (1964: 105-6) with the following recommendations:

> ...We would suggest that the Sioux be involved in the schooling of their children. At present the educational administrators of the

> Bureau prefer to hold the Indians at arm's length away from the schools... Only an organizational change, such as transferring some authority and responsibility to community representatives, offers the probability of being effective...

In 1969 the Senate Special Committee on Indian Education issued a report recommending that "Indian parental and community involvement be increased." (p. 120)

> The B.I.A. has been particularly lax in involving the participation of Indian parents and communities in the education process. Such involvement would have a beneficial effect on the attitude of Indian children toward their school and could be helpful in bringing about strengthened and enhanced education programs.

These recommendations, along with others such as those of Roessell (1968), Striner (1968), and McKinley, Bayne, and Nimnicht (1970), underscored the need for parental participation and control of education.

At the same time that studies recommending more participation of Indian parents in the schools were being published, the federal government was evolving programs that provided for the participation of local peoples in anti-poverty efforts. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (E.O.A.), part of President Johnson's War on Poverty, promoted "self-help" programs in "poverty communities" such as Headstart, the Job Corps, VISTA, and Upward Bound. In addition, Community Action Programs (C.A.P.) were started to involve local people in the management of such programs.

The Hopi "Experiment"

In the spring of 1968, members of the Hopi Tribal Council, the Hopi Action Program, the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the U.S. Office of Education, entered into negotiations leading to the development of a Follow Through Program, an innovative educational program, that derived from the Community Action Title (Title II) of the Economic Opportunity Act.

The Follow Through Program was to "follow through" on the preschool Headstart program by introducing into the elementary schools serving poverty children new approaches to education that would help maximize the gains made by Headstart.

The national Follow Through Guidelines, issued in Washington, directed that each local Follow Through Program was to be under the direction of a local organization called the Policy Advisory Committee (P.A.C.), at least half of whose members were to be parents.

> A basic tenent of Follow Through is that parents have the right and responsibility to share in determining the nature of their children's education. (1969: 5)

The funding of the Follow Through Program went to eleven sponsoring organizations at various research and development centers throughout the United States, each of which had developed a unique approach to elementary education. Each community that qualified for participation then had the option of choosing among these approaches. In May, 1968, the Hopi Tribe selected the Behavior Analysis Model for Follow Through based at the University of Kansas.

Beginning in August, 1968, the Behavior Analysis model (hereafter referred to as "the model") was implemented on a test basis in the first grade of Second Mesa Day School. From then until 1972, it was annually refunded by the Office of Education and approved by the Hopi Tribe. Also, the program by 1972 encompassed the first, second, and third grades of all five Hopi Day schools as well as the kindergartens at Moencopi, Polacca, and Second Mesa Day Schools.

Two major thrusts for change were built into the Hopi Follow Through Program:

> 1) It sought to improve the quality and accelerate the rate of academic instruction through the use of techniques of "positive reinforcement" such as a token economy and praise;
>
> 2) It attempted to involve the community in the education of their children.

As we have noted, the national Follow Through Guidelines stated that parents should have a significant role in the planning and running of the program through the P.A.C. The Hopi P.A.C. was made up entirely of parents who represent the local P.T.A.s.

Defining Our Research

Prior to the introduction of the Follow Through Program, the reservation schools were administered and directed wholly by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which was largely staffed by non-Hopi administrators. Hopi parents had no official means of controlling the educational policies and practices in the schools serving their children. The Follow Through Program was to provide the parents of children in these classrooms with an instrument, the P.A.C., and a

mandate for the control of the educational policies affecting their children and, as well, a means for parents to serve in the formal instructional processes of the classrooms.

Although the Hopis are culturally unique in many ways, their relationships with respect to the school establishment had been similar to those in many other Indian communities—isolation, social distance, lack of control. We felt that what happened in relation to Hopi schools and the community in terms of a relative redistribution of power or control over the school, via programs such as Follow Through, had significance in many places where ethnic minorities are seeking control over the institutions that affect them.

We felt that researching this aspect of the program would make a good follow-up study to those previously cited (Wax, Wax, and Dumont, King, and Wolcott) that had looked at schools and communities in mutual isolation. Here, in Hopiland, we had schools that were deliberately involving parents not only in the decision-making processes but in the classrooms themselves.

On another level, we were interested in looking at the program particularly with its community-control ideology as a manifestation of a changing complex of Indian-Anglo relationships. In the past, educational and change programs implemented among the Hopi by Euro-American groups had reflected how those groups defined their relations vis-à-vis the Hopi. In turn, the responses to those programs had reflected the Hopis' reactions to those definitions. As we shall see, for example, the missionary dominated school program of the Indian service of the late nineteenth century reflected the prevailing American assumption that Indians were ignorant, child-like, primitive peoples who needed to be transformed into bearers of American cultures if they were to be "saved." A new set of assumptions about the Hopis and their role in the educational process seemed implied in the Follow Through community control and involvement program, and we wanted to look at the Hopi responses to this new educational ideology.

We defined the issues surrounding Follow Through in a somewhat different manner than the Follow Through sponsor or the local educators, for our interests extended beyond measuring the academic achievements of individual children considered as social atoms as they progress in their instructional materials through time. Rather, we viewed the school as a social institution and wanted to look at the Follow Through program, and the schools it served, within the context of the wider Hopi community, thus designing the investigation as a community study---where the relations among diverse segments of the community are considered in terms of their relations to the school via

Follow Through.[1] We wanted to know how diverse groups within the Hopi Tribe and the Bureau of Indian Affairs school system defined or perceived the Follow Through program, and what sorts of actions or interrelations followed from those definitions.

The community study approach, focusing on the school, had been utilized by the Waxes and Dumont in their study of the schools serving the Oglala Sioux at Pine Ridge, South Dakota (1964) and in their study of the public school system serving the Cherokee of Oklahoma (1969). The works of Hollingshead (1949), Wolcott (1967), and King (1967), have also used the community study approach of the schools. Other community studies not directly focused on the school but yielding insights into the relations between the school establishment and the community are those by Gans (1961), Withers (1945), and Vidich and Bensman (1965).

On this research project we sought answers to the following specific questions:

> What do the Hopi people in the various villages want the schools to do for their children?
>
> What does the Follow Through Program contribute to satisfying these wants.
>
> How do the Hopi people feel about participating in the schools through the Follow Through program?
>
> What changes or improvements would the Hopi people like to see in the Follow Through program?
>
> Has the Follow Through program (especially parental involvement) caused any changes in Hopi society or the B.I.A. school system?
>
> Has the Follow Through parent program and the Policy Advisory Committee changed the relationship between the Hopi people and the B.I.A. school system?
>
> How does a group like the Hopi Tribe use a program like Follow Through to achieve its educational goals?

---

[1]See Wax, and Wax, "Great Tradition, Little Tradition, and Formal Education," in Anthropological Perspectives in Education, 1971.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The fieldwork for this report was conducted between May, 1970 and July, 1973. The work between May, 1970 and January , 1972 was done on a series of visits, usually of one week's duration, to the reservation. From January to mid-July, 1972 the fieldwork was done while the Graduate Research Assistant was in residence at New Oraibi, Arizona. From July, 1972 to July, 1973 the fieldwork again consisted of short trips to the Hopi reservation.

The basic research methodology consisted of participant observation as a Follow Through research assistant and as a resident of New Oraibi. Within this methodology, the Graduate Research Assistant also conducted interviews with parents who had children in the Follow Through Program and with educators and leaders.

While in residence on the reservation, the Graduate Research Assistant devoted one month to each school and the community it served. In February, he worked at Polacca Day School at First Mesa, March at Moencopi, April at Hotevilla, May at Hopi Day School in Oraibi, and June at Second Mesa serving the villages of Shungopovi, Mishongnovi, and Shipaulovi.

In each instance the approach was similar. First, the Graduate Research Assistant met with school P.T.A.s to explain the nature of the research and the procedures he planned to use and to request the help of the P.T.A. The P.T.A. was given the responsibility of approving a research aide who worked with the Graduate Research Assistant in the immediate area. The aide was always chosen from among the residents of the villages served by the school under intensive study.

In all, six aides were hired, one from each school, except at Second Mesa where the school board suggested dividing the position between Shungopovi and Shipaulovi or Mishongnovi. At Polacca, Moencopi, and Hotevilla, the P.T.A.s made the selection of aides from those who had applied. At Oraibi, the Graduate Research Assistant selected the aide based on a recommendation from the Hopi Action Program, and then the aide was unanimously approved by the P.T.A. At Second Mesa, the aides were recommended and approved by the school board. The aides were William Mahle (First Mesa), Thorden Holmes (Moencopi), Norman Qumyimptewa (Hotevilla), Lucille Namoki (Oraibi), Georgianna James (Shungopovi), and Lorena Charles (Shipaulovi).

After the aides were selected, the general pattern was to spend several days in acquainting them with the Follow Through Program by visiting classrooms to observe the special techniques associated with the model. On these occasions, formal and informal interviews were conducted with teachers and the principal.

The major research activity consisted of interviewing every available parent of Follow Through children. The interview was structured and consisted of fourteen questions. The aides assisted in keeping notes of interviews, in translating from Hopi to English, in locating community members, and in helping to establish rapport with respondents. In addition, the aides themselves often commented upon the local school situation and participated in the interpretation of responses. The total of interviews with Follow Through parents was as follows: Polacca, 56; Moencopi, 22; Hotevilla, 26; Oraibi, 20; Second Mesa, 54. The total number of across-reservation interviews was 178.

The Graduate Research Assistant conducted all of the interviews with the help of the aides, except at Second Mesa where the aides did the interviewing by themselves after some instruction.

In addition, the Graduate Research Assistant attended from May, 1970 to July, 1973 eight P.A.C. meetings, eleven P.T.A. meetings, one teachers' meeting, and one principals' meeting.

Besides the observations and interviews made immediately in and around the school, the Graduate Research Assistant's residence at Oraibi provided innumberable opportunities to study the cultural context in which the school operated. He was able to learn of phases of Hopi life and make friends and acquaintances who helped him learn of community attitudes towards formal education. His residence in the community also enabled him to establish several long-term relationships with teachers who provided him with an "insider's view" of the Follow Through Program operation and community reaction to it.

The research was originally undertaken at the request of the director of the University of Kansas Follow Through Program. He expressed great interest in having an anthropologist study the impact of the program on the community and urged the Graduate Research Assistant to investigate any aspect of the program he felt necessary.

RESULTS I

How Hopi Parents View The Schools Today (1973)

One of the first questions we desired to answer was "What do the Hopi people in the various villages want the school to do for their children?" We found the following:

From their beginnings in the 1870's, the schools on the Hopi Reservation have been defined as Anglo institutions (see Breunig 1973). Today most Hopis have accepted that definition, regarding schools as places where they send their children to learn "White man's ways." Although they regard the school as an institution standing apart from their own communities, they see the school as a positive institution where children learn things that are "useful" for them.

> I like the things they are having taught in school, because in our time we didn't learn these things. So I like it [the school].
> (Old Oraibi, 5/11/72)

* * *

> I'd rather that they go to school and learn what they can and not just be out of school. They should learn everything they teach them there. (Polacca, 2/14/72)

Today (1973) most parents accept school as a normal and necessary part of their children's life and, judging from the tenor of their remarks about schools, any suggestion to the contrary would be greeted with incredulity.

What School Should Teach

Hopi parents expect alot from the schools serving their children. They want them to teach the language (English), academic skills, and cultural manners that they feel their children will need to "make it" in the Anglo dominated wider society. Given this function of the school, they resist innovations aimed at incorporating elements of Hopi culture into the school.[2]

Because the schools are primarily defined as places to learn Anglo ways, Hopi parents insist that the school

---

[2]These views of the school are similar to those described by Wax, Wax, and Dumont for the Dakota (Sioux) at Pine Ridge, South Dakota, 1964.

teach the kinds of academic subjects found in most Anglo-American schools---English, reading, mathematics, spelling, and handwriting. In addition, many parents express a desire for such all-American activities such as band, choir, and physical education. These attitudes towards the role of the school in the community can be seen in the following table (Table 1) in response to an interview question "What do Hopi children need to be taught the most?" Here are some examples of the responses:

> They should be taught about school and why they should go there. Everyday is a learning experience... We've never stopped to teach them things. Here [at school] they learn about math, English, and all. (Hotevilla, 4/7/72)
>
> * * *
>
> Basic things. We are concerned with the elementary things. We see the needs. I've seen my daughter's tests---there are lots of needs with reading. This too is the age of mathematics... (Polacca, 2/72)
>
> * * *
>
> They should be taught like any other kids, like in public schools. (Polacca, 2/14/72)
>
> * * *
>
> What they have there [at school]. Subjects that are there like reading, writing, learning more English. We need to learn more of White man's ways. We are not going back to our old Indian way. (Polacca, 2/72)

Hopis not only expect the schools to be modeled on those in the Anglo society, but judge their quality in comparison to them. At P.T.A. meetings and other school related affairs, Hopi schools and the progress of the students are evaluated in relation to "national norms," i.e., comparison with the California Achievement Test (C.A.T.) and the Wide Range Achievement Test (W.R.A.T.). Special programs are urged upon the parents because Hopi students are said to have "deficiencies" in comparison to non-Hopi students. The major school effort is to bring everyone up to the "national average."

This view of education tends to make parents evaluate their own school program in terms of how fast the children are moving through their materials and how well they perform in relation to the national average. For example, one mother who worked in the Follow Through Program described what she liked about the program class:

> The model calls for a progress report on each child. That's very necessary too, the graphs.

We follow up on the parent aides and lead teacher that way. It's right here to see how they are doing. If they see a drop, they worry about it and bring in alot of extra things to make the graph go up...
(Hotevilla, 2/1/72)

In all of our visits to P.T.A. meetings on the reservation, we heard nothing of how Hopi children were unique, or that they had particular or peculiar capabilities and potentials that could be utilized in the overall education process personality development of Hopi children.

What Should Not Be Taught In School

Parental conceptions of the school and its role with relation to the community are most clearly expressed when parents say what they do not want the school to teach their children. It should be noted that we did not ask this question, but instead, the parents volunteered their comments on what should not be taught when asked what should be taught.

Although some parents did mention that they would like to see some aspect of Hopi language or culture taught in the school (see Table 1, page 15), a majority of mothers volunteered opinions opposed to such activities.

Some say they should learn more about their own culture. I don't necessarily agree with that. I've been working with Navajo kids at Brigham City and the Navajo kids are always learning their own culture. In some ways it has a bad effect on them. They can't go on living like that. Everyone is living like White men now---we should teach our kids like that. (Polacca, 2/8/72)

* * * *

They should be taught the White man's way. I think it's up to the parents to teach them our own Hopi language. (Polacca, 2/11/72)

* * * *

English. That's why we sent our children to school... We can teach them our culture at home. (Polacca, 2/10/72)

* * * *

...They say they are starting to teach Hopi, but that should be left to home...
(Polacca, 2/72)

TABLE 1

"What Do Hopi Children Need to be Taught the Most?"

Responses	No.		%
	287	=	100
Basic academic skills	197		69
English, grammar	106		37
Reading	36		13
Math	38		13
Writing	10		4
Spelling	6		2
Sciences	1		-
Supplementary Skills	7		2
Sports, physical education	2		
Music	3		
Arts and crafts	2		
Hopi (language and/or culture)	32		11
"Everything at school"	17		6
Manners, respect, good behavior, cooperation, etc.	17		6
"White man's ways"	6		2
Vocational skills, a vocation	2	>	1
Things like in public schools	2		
Total Responses	280		98
Don't Know	7		2

> We do not want our beliefs and dances taught in the school. That is for the village-- it is not for school. When they are smarter they can still learn things, bring books home and read them by themselves. Our parents didn't encourage us to stay in school and learn these things. When I was in the teen years, I didn't learn much, so I want them to learn. (Hotevilla, 4/14/72)

* * *

> They shouldn't be teaching these Hopi things like dances in the schools. They learn these things at home. We want them to get an education. That's what they [the Anglos] are always talking about---education.
> (Hotevilla, 4/72)

There were other responses about why the parents did not want Hopi culture taught in school when asked, "Is there anything your child learns at school that displeases you?"

> Hopi traditional culture. It can be done at home. It is not what they are sent to school for. (Hotevilla, 8/8/72)

* * *

> Just lately, they've been learning about Hopi things...recording things on tape. I went to the teacher and asked what they were using and (name) showed me a book, a small booklet on Hopi. There were all these snake dancers and all in it... Then they had questions to answer, what kachinas are used and things like that. That should not be in there. We talk alot [about culture at home] and they will learn them. English and math are very important to me rather than the Hopi stuff--maybe later--they are too young now. They should really know about English.
> (Hotevilla, 4/18/72)

The same attitudes were also expressed at a P.T.A. meeting at Hotevilla. A teacher had assigned his fourth grade class to do some independent research by giving them questions they were to answer on their own. Several parents came to the meeting to protest this kind of activity, primarily because they felt that was frivolous and because the questions came too close to "Hopi culture."

> Mr. Black,* the fourth grade teacher...has been teaching the children to do research on their own. He asks them questions such as 'How big

---

*All proper names in this report are fictitious.

is the Hopi reservation?' 'How much of the land is jointly occupied by Hopi and Navajos?' In addition, he has been teaching them to seek answers on their own by going to dictionaries and encyclopedias. The reasons for this, he said, was so that the children could learn to think for themselves and learn how to find answers to their own questions. He said, 'We are not here to fill their heads with facts, to cram alot of knowledge into their heads, but to teach them to explain and learn on their own and we thought it would be more fun for them to learn with topics they were interested in and which were close to home...' Somewhere in his explanation Mr. Black used the words 'Hopi culture.'

He asked for permission to teach in this manner and said he felt it was important to do so. The P.T.A. president said that Hopi culture could not be taught in the schools, that this was something to be done in the village and not at the school. The school was set up to teach White ways and they wanted it kept that way. Mr. Black said that he was only teaching them about plants, types of crops, houses, etc., and not with ritual things.

A long discussion in Hopi ensued. My aide periodically translated to me. The discussion seemed to center around the definition of the word 'culture.' Parents (especially one angry mother) objected to the teaching of any culture in the school, for by 'culture' they thought Mr. Black was referring to their religion. (In fact, some religion had entered the schools as I noticed on the walls were student drawings of kachinas and I had heard that a 'song' was evidently performed in a Headstart classroom. Mrs. Grey, a teacher, said that the children couldn't help themselves, that they just broke out into Longhair [kachina] songs and she didn't want to stop them.) They don't seem to be making a distinction between religion and culture.

After a prolonged discussion in Hopi, the P.T.A. (begrudgingly I thought) agreed that he could teach about Hopi things except for things relating to religion--religion still not defined. One mother persisted, however, wondering why they weren't just teaching them what they were

> supposed to rather than have them ask alot of questions. (The children had been coming home seeking answers to the research questions.) Mr. Black said that he wanted to teach them to learn on their own rather than expecting them to learn a fixed body of knowledge.
> (Fieldnotes, Hotevilla, 4/5/72)

It should be noted here that it was at this meeting that we heard the only major challenge to school policy procedures or educational philosophy or any open criticism of the practices of a single teacher.

We have argued elsewhere that Hopi parents do not see the school as "theirs" and do not believe they should make educational decisions. The fact that the parents did in this instance raise these objections indicates to us the strength of their opinions in this matter.

Comment

In the above, we see that many parents do not want the school to teach Hopi language and culture, for they do not see the school as an institution where their language and culture are to be transmitted. There are several reasons for this:

First, as is seen in the very first quote, some parents (although a minority) believe that the traditional culture is useless altogether in terms of preparing children for the "modern" White man's world. This view is not simply held by those who are "White-oriented," but also by those who by the reservaton classification system would be regarded as traditionals. One "traditional" man said this:

> They have to learn to live like White men now. These kids don't understand Hopi culture at all now. It's gone. Soon there will be nothing left; so they might as well learn to live like White men. (Hotevilla man at New Oraibi, 5/21/72)

This attitude is not uncommon among older Hopis. They define Hopi culture as they knew it years ago and see the recent changes as evidence of its demise. Their views in this respect are similar to those anthropologists described by Murray Wax who see culture as possessing a "unity of a pottery vessel--a cup--and like such a vessel it could only be whole or shattered." (Wax 1972)

Indeed, one gets the impression from older Hopis that, in their thinking, some rubicon has been crossed, that irreversible cultural disintegration has taken place as the

result of the decline of old customs; the only way for young people to go is as the man quoted above said, "To live like White men." Some of them believe this situation was prophecied in Hopi mythology and must be fatalistically accepted.

A group who hold a second point of view are the parents who say that Hopi culture should be learned, but that its transmission should be the exclusive responsibility of the community. They see the school as an Anglo institution which should then simply teach Anglo subjects while leaving Hopi matters to the villages. Schools socialize for White culture, and the community socializes for Hopi culture.

Also, as noted in our fieldnotes of April 5, 1972, Hopis do not make a distinction between their culture and their religion. The distinction and the categories are Anglo. Indeed, the Hopi culture is pervaded with religious concepts. Every traditional activity from planting corn to grinding it, from presenting a child to the village twenty days after birth to marriage is religiously integrated. One cannot, then, talk about "Hopi culture" without involving some aspect of "Hopi religion."

> ...The Hopi preceded every important act with prayer, and with these older Hopi, the ideal was apt to be fact. A bag of sacred cornmeal was part of their daily equipment.
> (Eggan in Spindler 1963: 335)

Accompanying this concept is the feeling that Anglos should not know about Hopi religion. Teaching it in the school would imply knowledge of it by Anglo teachers or would expose it to Anglo view.

> I noticed that she had been making plaques. I asked her what she had. She showed me a beautiful yellow one with four kachina faces on it. She said she hoped that young ones would learn how to do this. 'Should it be taught in the school?' I asked. 'No, they should not. Our grandmothers told us to keep these things in the village. That goes for Hopi culture too.' I asked why. 'If we teach it in the school, the secrets will come out and White people aren't to learn of these things.'
> (Fieldnotes, Hotevilla, 4/18/72)

* * * *

> They shouldn't practice Hopi so much at school. Seems they are showing off to other people on this. What they really should learn is the

> White man's way [rather] than their own doings which will be taught at home by parents. Seems like they are teaching or showing their way of life to White men than learning the White man's way. (Shungopovi, 6/72)

Those Hopis who actively participate in religious ceremonials are jealous of the secrets. Many feel that too much has been exposed to outside view already and that constant and continued exposure of the esoteric aspects of their religion can do it great damage. (One of the greatest sources of suspicion about an Anglo interloper on the reservation is the fear that he is "after" religious secrets and will "write another book" about them.)

One man reported that many Hopis were extremely disturbed because some businessmen in Prescott calling themselves the "Smokies" were performing reenactments of the Hopi snake dance. These reenactments he said were believed to have "messed up" their ceremonies and may have in the view of some been responsible for a recent drought.

Finally, the religious activities must be done within the proper context. Religious acts, paraphenalia and songs all have power in Hopi thinking. To bring "culture," i.e., religion into the school, would be in Hopi thinking taking it out of proper ritual context and would be dangerous misuse of the power in religious acts.[3]

Those Who Favor Hopi Culture in the Schools

A look at Table 1 above indicates that a minority of people said that they favored teaching of Hopi language and culture in response to the question "What do Hopi children need to be taught the most?" Half of the responses involving Hopi language and culture come from First Mesa, and, significantly, the First Mesa area is considered the least traditional on the reservation. First Mesa people have been the most receptive to outside innovations such as electricity and running water, and have more contact with Anglo people. Their children generally speak English rather than Hopi, also.

Those whose responses to the question suggest the teaching of Hopi language and culture do so out of a sense of loss, usually acquired because they did not spend much of their early life on the reservation learning basic Hopi ways as did others.

---

[3]We use "power" here in the sense that Wax and Wax have used it in the article, "The Magical World View."

I think Hopi children need arts and crafts and to be taught their customs and language. I try to teach them at home but not enough. I don't know enough myself. I don't know who all my relatives are. The oldest boy wanted to know why he didn't follow his father's and grandfather's clans, but mine. I told him I didn't know. (Polacca, 2/14/72)

* * * *

English...and maybe Hopi language because our children don't know how to talk Hopi. We talk Hopi to the old lady [older woman who was asleep in a corner chair] but our children don't learn it. (Polacca, 2/14/72)

At Old Oraibi and New Oraibi, we specifically asked about the teaching of Hopi culture at the end of my interviews. Again, those who favored teaching it the most were those who felt a loss in it. Here is an exchange where both mother and father inferred this:

Fieldworker: Do you think Hopi culture should be taught in the schools?
Mother: Yes, we want that. I never learned the language much myself.
Father: Do you mean arts and crafts?
Fieldworker: It can mean that.
Father: If they start that I'll be the first one over there [to learn it].
(New Oraibi, 5/10/72)

Again, after the same question, a mother responded:

I'm for that. I grew up not knowing how to speak Hopi and my kids don't know about Indian culture. It's embarrassing when White people ask you about your own culture and you don't know anything about your background. We don't know alot of things our grandmothers on the mesa knew and I'd like to have it taught. (New Oraibi, 5/10/72)

In the above quote, there is also the element of embarrassment expressed of not knowing about one's own culture. In this case, we might speculate that this woman might have been affected by the value that certain sections of Anglo and Indian society place on "returning to one's heritage and one's roots." Whether out of genuine concern about regaining cultural identity or of concern of not being embarrassed by people valuing cultural identity, this woman felt she lacked the knowledge she needed to handle either situation.

What the Schools are Expected to do

The assumption among Hopi parents today is that when today's children are adults, virtually no one will be engaged in traditional subsistence activities. The transition from a horticultural subsistence economy to a wage-work economy has made it imperative in the eyes of the parents that the children get a good education in order to get a good job. One woman expressed it succinctly:

> ...These kids aren't going to go work in the fields. They are too lazy, so they must learn to get a job. (Hotevilla, 4/18/72)

When asked, "What things should your child learn to prepare him for a good life?" a mother replied, "English. Education is important now days so they can get a job." (Polacca, 2/10/72) And yet another mother said:

> The children should not quit school. They should finish high school or college. That way they would have a better life. I never finished high school and it is real hard for me. (Moencopi, 3/11/72)

One who attends many reservation P.T.A. meetings and who hears parents discuss educational matters gets the distinct impression that to many parents what is to happen in school takes on an aura of magic. If the children can complete so many grades, absorb all the learning that the teacher can provide, learn good English, and stick it out through high school, a good job and a secure life will follow almost automatically. The teacher is believed to possess a set body of knowledge which the child is to learn as one might learn a ritual, and if this is accomplished, the door of opportunity will open for the child. Because of this perspective, some parents want the school to stick to the basic skills, resisting digression into what they consider subjects that will not lead to a good job.

> Fieldworker: Is there anything your child learns at school that displeases you?
> Father: Too much other activities like pottery. They go to school clean in the morning and come home dirty in the evening. They need more school work to help them in their <u>education</u>. I'm happy when they bring home something that shows accomplishment...[4] (Hotevilla, 4/18/72)

---

[4]Note that "education" here does not include ceramics.

This interpretation of the Hopi view of basics makes some sense if one looks at the logic of the Hopi religious system. A Hopi participates in ceremonies and performs ritual acts in order to maintain a harmonious relationship with the natural world. The proper use of ritual ways keeps the universe in balance and brings such beneficial things as rain and good crops. In addition, if the ceremonial acts are to have efficacy, they must be performed by the proper people who hold the requisite knowledge.

If we apply this system of thought to the school system, then Hopi attitudes towards formal education and the role of the teacher are consistent with the traditional system. The teacher has knowledge; acquisition of that knowledge will guarantee academic success and future employment. In effect if children are going to "make it" in the "White man's world," they must learn his ritual and the knowledge it takes to acquire and properly use power.

The practical benefits of a good education are evident. Many of the new jobs on the reservation are with tribal or federal agencies which generally require a high school diploma. Those Hopis who hold down well-paying jobs in the Agency, the Bureau of Indian Affairs school system, the Public Health Service Hospital at Keam's Canyon, and the Hopi Tribe, are those who have acquired the requisite knowledge and degrees.

Finally, several people viewed education <u>in part</u> as a means by which information could be communicated to those who do not speak English, by which they could express their feelings and information to non-Hopis.

> Children should learn English and help parents interpret things... The children should come home and explain things to parents.
> (Hotevilla, 4/11/72)

Some "Traditionals" feel that many of the actions by the government which have affected them have happened because they did not understand what was occurring and because they have not been able to communicate their own feelings to the government.

> [They should learn] English because later on English will be important to Hopi people--- those who know it can be spokesmen for the people. That's why it comes first.
> (New Oraibi, 5/5/72)

The Question of English

As we have seen, because most Hopis who are parents and grandparents today went to school where the schools were defined as Anglo institutions, so they too have accepted that definition. This definition of the situation has affected the structure of the relationship, i.e., it has created a superordinate-subordinate relationship between Anglos and Hopis with regard to the schools. In addition, it also has had a profound affect on how the Hopis perceive themselves vis a vis Anglos within the context of the new institutions.

To analyze the situation more closely, it might be useful to look at the concept of the self as it applies here.[5] In part, our feelings about ourselves in certain situations are a result of our joint interactions with other people, and of how we and they define the particular situations we are in. When peoples meet, the parties on each side bring a set of assumptions about the other to the interaction. These assumptions may be stated explicitly or be implicitly imbedded in the very structure of the relationship. As we talk and act among other peoples, as we begin to observe their actions and they ours, we both begin to modify our behavior in accordance with our own definition of the situation and in accordance to how we think the other party defines it. As the interaction proceeds and as we see how others respond to us, we begin to form an image of ourselves as we are performing and shaping our behavior in that situation.

Having long been placed in a subordinate position to Anglos within the school context, Hopis have come to feel inferior and thus incompetent to make educational decisions. Hence, the schools should be as Anglos prescribe, because they as educational experts "must know what they are talking about if they are in there."[6]

This feeling of subordination is most clearly expressed with regard to the use of English. From the founding of the schools to very recent times, Anglo educational administrators have insisted that only English be taught in the schools. Fluency in English has become the criteria for success and a measure of intelligence. Many Hopis have accepted this interpretation of English. One older Hopi woman expressed it to us this way:

---

[4] See the concept of the self as discussed by G.H. Mead (1962), Herbert Blumer (1969), and Erving Goffman (1959).

[5] Many variations of this statement were made to us during our fieldwork. This specific quote was made on April 17, 1972.

When I went down here to school at Oraibi, we weren't allowed to talk Hopi; if we did we were hit with a strap. So I learned never to talk it on campus. That's why I think they should talk English down there. They can always talk Hopi at home. (Oraibi, 5/11/72)

A few nights later the same woman, an aide at the school, told of an incident at the school:

I heard some Second Mesa boys talking Hopi in the hall of the school so I went up to them and said, 'Boys, would you mind speaking in English here at school. You can talk Hopi at home but you came here to learn English so I wish you would.' And so they said 'all right' and walked off talking English. (Oraibi, 5/15/72)

Anxiety over this matter of English is commonly expressed by Hopi parents who insist that above all their children should learn to speak English well. (See Table 1) Although many want children to learn "good English" for practical and pragmatic reasons (such as getting a new job), others express a more profound reason directly related to he child's image of himself. Here are some examples of this when Hopi parents were asked "What do Hopi children need to be taught the most?"

Father: English! Definitely English!
Fieldworker: Why English?
Father: Our people are going off the reservation more often. A lot go over to Flagstaff and the White people are coming here. A lot of these people feel stupid when they meet up with White people. They get tongue-tied and can't talk English good so they feel dumb. They have to get over that. That's why they need to learn good English in school. (Moencopi, 3/10/72)

* * * *

Mother: I feel it's English and math. What we are going through now, they will need those things the most. Of course, I teach them Hopi culture at home, but they should learn English at school.
Fieldworker: I don't understand what you mean by 'what we are going through now.'

Mother: They might have a real need for this in the higher levels and when they go off the reservation. When White people come around here and I don't know how to talk to them, it's hard and I can't translate to English well. It's hard to put Hopi words into English so I want them to learn good English. (Old Oraibi, 5/72)

* * * *

Mother: The sports and music, and English, too.
Father: That's what we've been heading for; we never made it. Now days you have to compare with Whites to get a job. We aren't educated and it's hard to communicate. You go to get a job and you talk to the man there. Well, sometimes he thinks you are a dumb Indian. Because you can't speak English he thinks you are dumb. But when you get to know them, you find that you are smarter than they are. Sometimes I get real mad and say, 'Ok, you ***, you want to find out how dumb I am? Well, here's my fist! (Hotevilla, 4/72)

* * * *

Mother: I'm happy they are going to school and learning all they can, not like us dumb ones who don't get anything into our heads. They should learn more English so they can speak for themselves when speaking to White people and so they can speak for us. I'm thankful they [her children] all went to school. I've got two in college. I'm glad they didn't grow up to be like their mother, not dumb like me. (New Oraibi, 5/72)

* * * *

A parent aide at a school explained why English is so important for education of Hopis because they 'need to learn English so they can speak up for themselves and present themselves right to White people.' (emphasis by fieldworker) (Fieldnotes, Hotevilla, 4/72)

When speaking of English usage, a common theme runs through these and other responses that we received. These individuals are referring to how they feel with relation to Anglos, how they think they present themselves or appear to Anglos, and how they think Anglos look at them.

When a Hopi who cannot speak "good English" enters into interaction with an Anglo (especially one that appears

articulate in English, well-educated, and professional) he may feel a loss of dignity or equality and the kind of assurance which he might exhibit in his interactions with other Hopi. Again as one father put it:

> Mostly they need to learn English. Like with me, not very good English is coming out. They shouldn't have broken English like me. If you are a kid and don't understand, you don't know what to answer back. (Polacca, 2/7/72)

What this man is saying is that because his English is broken, Anglos may look upon him as inarticulate, as in fact they do. In sensing this, he feels at a disadvantage. He knows he is able, but the Anglos do not. Many Hopis are very definite on this point.

When a preliminary version of this analysis was read at Hotevilla on April 10, 1973, the Hopis in attendance indicated that they know that they are just as able as Anglos, but because they lack fluency in English, they assume Anglos look down on them, so they see themselves in that situation as dumb.

If this kind of interaction persists over a lifetime, some individuals in time actually become convinced that they are dumb. Learning "good English" then becomes a defense mechanism, a way to maintain one's dignity with Anglos, of communicating their equal abilities to the Anglos.

It should be noted here that Hopis actually feel very ambivalent towards Anglos. In many respects, Hopis think Anglos are "dumb," i.e., materialistic, agressive, and lacking in the rich ceremonialism of the Hopi. These opinions are most vividly expressed by Hopi clowns who mimic white behavior at Hopi dances. For example, at one dance Hopi clowns dressed as Public Health Service doctors, got out of a shiny new car and proceeded to polish the car and inspect the tires while another clown pretending to be a woman in labor writhed on the ground in front of them. At another dance, Easter Sunday 1972, clowns dressed as missionaries carrying Bibles and baskets full of plastic grass with Easter eggs, skipped into a village plaza, and sang "Jesus Loves Me." They then proceeded to shake their fingers at the crowd while reading Bible verses. To finish the act, they pulled three long-haired Anglos from the crowd and debated which was the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

In fact, within purely Hopi contexts, the situation is quite different from that in which Anglos are involved.

In terms of internal village matters, say in the organization and coordination of ceremonial dances, Hopis feel competent about their roles and institutional abilities.

Feelings of subordination are, then, situational depending upon the context of the interaction. Hopi feelings of subordination with respect to the school as an institution is a product of joint Anglo-Hopi interactions over the last century.

Who Should Make Educational Decisions: The Image of the Teacher as Professional

We have seen that Hopi parents see the schools as Anglo institutions. This conception of the institution bears directly upon the question of who should control the schools. Most Hopi parents are convinced that it takes a great amount of technical skill and knowledge to be a teacher. This attitude is reinforced by the fact that to obtain a teaching certificate one is required to have four years of college.

Given such a view, most parents believe that decisions about school matters should then be left to these "experts," i.e., those who are trained to make technical decisions in the classroom as well as those about general education--teachers. These views are summarized in Table 2 and illustrated in the following quotes:

> If you have a professional, they are the ones who know what to teach our children. They went to school and they had the training so it is their job to decide. If they send a note home telling me to help my kids, I send back a note saying they are the professionals and it is their job. (emphasis by fieldworker) (Polacca, 2/15/72)
>
> * * * *
>
> The teachers, because they know what they need to teach and what our children need to know. (Shungopovi, 6/72)
>
> * * * *
>
> The teachers know more than the uneducated parents. (Shipaulovi, 6/72)
>
> * * * *
>
> The head teacher should decide these things. They know about it and see the kids all the time. (Moencopi, 3/6/72)
>
> * * * *
>
> The teachers should make the decisions. They are in there to teach so the child will learn something in school. (Hotevilla, 4/10/72)

TABLE 2

"Who Should Make Decisions On What the School Teaches Your Child?"

Responses	No.		%
	193	=	100
Teachers	87		45
Parents	42		22
Principals	19		10
Follow Through Staff (local)	6		3
P.T.A.	5		3
Bureau of Indian Affairs	2		1
University of Kansas (F.T. Sponsor)	5		3
OTHER:	16		9
"Ones who are head of it"	3		
School board	6		
All connected with schools	4		
P.A.C.	1		
Tribal Council	1		
Education Committee	1		
Total Responses	182		95
Don't Know	10		5
Doesn't Matter	1		

It is clear from these responses (and many others like them) that parents tend to see the school as the educational province of the teachers. These feelings derive, in part, from years of indoctrination by the teachers and the reservation educational establishment. The director of a federally funded reservation program found this view of parents somewhat troublesome to her when trying to run her program.

> Miss Maxwell said that she gets very frustrated because parents and parent groups always come and say, 'Can we do this or can we do that?' She wants to say, 'Damn it. It's your program. Of course you can do it.' They rely heavily on her and the permission of the staff to do anything... She feels this is conditioning that has been imparted by their relationship with the B.I.A. (Fieldnotes, 3/10/71)

The Hopi view in this matter reflects the feeling that the schools should be run by those "who are supposed" to run it rather than the parents.

It should be noted that most of those who did say the parents should run the schools were from the First Mesa area where there has been much more opportunity to discuss community control and where there is a long tradition of working with Anglo-derived institutions.

The extent to which this feeling that professionals should be those who run the schools is illustrated at Hotevilla where several fathers were critical of the principal because he favored a community-control ideology:

> Fieldworker: Who should make the decisions on what the school teachers your child?
> Father: The principal--that's why he's there. He shouldn't listen to the village people. He should do it himself. If he lets the village people run it, they will take over. There are people in the area office who know how to run it better anyway. (emphasis by fieldworker) (Hotevilla, 4/19/72)

* * * *

> (in response to same question)
> Father: It's up to the principal. There's all these things there--Headstart and Teacher Corps--and he has to show who's boss. (Hotevilla, 4/72)

Comment

The respect Hopis express towards teachers is similar to that shown towards professional educators in other segments of American society. Although teachers and school administrators may not be personally admired, their presumed professional knowledge and judgment is generally accepted. This tendency may be reinforced in the Hopi situation by a respect for the knowledge and training of traditional religious leaders. Although as individuals they may not be respected, their knowledge is, for it is through such knowledge that one acquires the ability to direct religious ceremonies. Those who do not have the requisite knowledge would not think of attempting to do those things for which they are not properly trained.

To put this point on a broader perspective, Rosalie Wax and Robert K. Thomas have described the generalized country Indian characteristic of avoiding tasks which the individual does not feel capable of doing. (Wax and Thomas in Bahr et al 1972: 31-41) They quote one Indian man who made this observation:

> As a result of the way they are raised, very few Indians will try to do something at which they're not good [adept]. It takes a lot of courage.
>
> You watch a housebuilding among my people. You see some men struggling with the work of erecting the structure, and, over there, sitting on the grass, may be a man, just watching, never lending a hand, even with the heaviest work. They get the structure up, and all of a sudden there's that man on the roof, working away, laying shingle--because what he knows how to do is lay shingle. All these men that were there are kin come to help with the housebuilding, but each person only offers his assistance in what he knows he can do. (1972: 32-33)

The Hopi parents who see the running of the school as one that should be left up to "those who know how to do it" do so out of fear of exposing their own imagined inabilities in the matter.

RESULTS II:

The Hopi Follow Through Program

In the last section, we discussed how Hopi parents defined the school and their roles in it. It was necessary for us to know these definitions as they were of importance in understanding parental involvement in the school program.

To go one step further, we wanted to understand how the Follow Through Program had affected the parents' conceptions of themselves in relation to the school, and to understand how the Follow Through staff defined its involvement in the Hopi schools. To do this, we studied (a) the interrelationships between parents, the community, teachers, and the Follow Through staff and (b) how each of these parties related to and the extent to which they became involved in the overall Follow Through objectives.

The Behavior Analysis Model for Follow Through

Before describing the impact of the Follow Through Program on parental perceptions of the school, we will give a brief summary of the basic components of the program as it operated on the Hopi reservation. The key concept of the Behavior Analysis model was that through the use of positive reinforcement,[6] teachers can change children's behaviors. If one manipulates the environment properly, children will engage in "appropriate" learning behaviors.

1. Behavioral Objectives

In Behavior Analysis thinking, before one attempts to modify behaviors, there should be a clearly established goal in mind. That is, it should be clearly stated what the children are to do. For pre-schoolers in the Headstart level, the objective was to instill the "entire constellation of behaviors which make up the social role of the student," i.e., following the instructions of the teachers, saying "good morning" to the teacher, learning how to raise their hands to get attention, and learning to "distinguish between the time to talk and the time to listen" (from The Behavior Analysis Classroom 1971: 17). For children in the kindergarten, first, second, and third grades, the objective was to motivate them so they would progress as rapidly as possible through their curriculum materials.

---

[6] Theoretical negative reinforcers could be utilized, but the Behavior Analysis model provides for only positive reinforcement and forbids the use of negative reinforcement.

2. The Materials

Once these "behavioral objectives" had been established, the children were set to work in their books. These materials consisted of programmed work books—that is, the children moved through their books step by step, problem by problem, being reinforced each step along the way. The materials were generally laid out so that the child could learn immediately whether his answers were right or wrong (immediate feedback).

3. Motivational System

To motivate the children to engage in "appropriate" behaviors, tokens were given to the children by a teacher when they exhibited such behaviors. The theory was that when a child is reinforced for a behavior, the chances were good he would repeat it in order to get reinforced again. By reinforcing desired behaviors, one could "shape" a child into behaving properly. For example, if a child sits at his desk quietly before class, hands folded, the teacher will reinforce this behavior by giving him a token and praising him with, "I like the way you are sitting quietly, Alvin." Although no specific reference was made to the tokens, the child presumably got the message—do what the teacher wants and you will be rewarded. Children who were engaged in "inappropriate behaviors" were to be ignored (rather than reinforced for such behaviors by punishing because some children are reinforced by such punishment). Rather, when they saw good children accumulating tokens, they (in theory) began acting "appropriately." Tokens were given for all kinds of "good" behaviors such as exhibiting good manners and working in the programmed readers.

The operation of the Behavior Analysis token system required some skill, for timing the dispensing of tokens was considered important. The giving of the token was to be directly linked to the "good" behavior. Also, the tokens were to be delivered with varying frequency depending upon the difficulty of the task and the ability of the student. If a child had trouble with his work, he was consistently reinforced for every small accomplishment towards the goal. As the child became more accomplished in a particular behavior, the rate of token-giving for that behavior declined and was directed to other unlearned or "problem" behaviors.

4. Token Exchange

The tokens had no intrinsic value. Rather, they were to be an immediate, tangible symbol of a reinforcement to come, the "backup." The backup was an object or activity that a child "bought" with his tokens. (Work periods were called "earn" periods and exchange periods were called "spend" periods.) Teachers were to evaluate what kind of

spend activities the children desired and arrange them in order of preference so that the most desired activity would require the exchange of the greatest number of tokens. In Hopi Follow Through classrooms, backups included the following: Lincoln logs, metal toy houses, appliances (sinks, stoves, refrigerators), toy telephones, animal games, puzzles, guns, baby dolls, coloring books, basketballs, and being able to play outside. By observing the popularity of each item, the teacher determined its "price." She may say, "Today, boys and girls, going outside will cost you fifteen tokens."

5. Individualized Instruction

The Behavior Analysis model placed a special emphasis on "individualized instruction"; that is, each child was to work at his own rate through the programmed curriculum materials. The rationale behind this method was to prevent a "lock step" approach to education that could occur when all children (despite varying abilities) were working at the same rate. That practice, it was argued, penalized the fast student by holding him back and hurt the slow student by moving him at a rate that was faster than his ability to comprehend. By individualizing the instruction, then, the child moved through the curriculum materials at his own rate. This procedure enabled the faster child to move through the materials quickly, thus preventing boredom and allowing the slow child to move at a rate which prevented him from getting lost and discouraged. It is the ultimate in a tracking system.

It was also said that this system eliminated competition. Each child competed only with himself. He was to be rewarded as he progressed at his own rate and was not to be rewarded because he accomplished more than other children.

6. Parental Involvement

To make the model work, many people were required, because the progress of each child was to be monitored in order to provide reinforcement at the proper time. To make this possible, Behavior Analysis Follow Through hired parents to work in the program. In each classroom there were three parents (one being a permanent teacher aide) plus a lead teacher.

Each parent took charge of a group of four or five children and engaged in "instruction"; that is, each parent supervised the working of four to five students and dispensed tokens to them. The only real instruction the parent normally did was to provide assistance when a child was stuck in his materials.

The parents served as classroom teachers on a rotating basis. One in the classroom, hired under funds from

Title I Program, worked the entire school year and was required to have a high school diploma (a Hopi Tribe requirement). The other two were hired directly through Follow Through funds, worked six to ten weeks, and were not required to have a high school diploma or any educational requirement.

In theory, all parents had to have an opportunity to work in the program, and we found that most had except for those who declined or who worked somewhere else during the day. The parents were selected by the Policy Advisory Committee, which we will discuss later.

7. Measuring Results

The Follow Through staff monitored the progress of a class by having the teacher keep records on how each day was spent (D.S.F., Daily Schedule Form). The teacher listed all activities engaged in during the day and the amount of time spent on each. The teacher was supposed to spend most of the day on "basic skills," i.e., reading, writing, math, and spelling. In addition, a weekly report was kept on each child's progress, the Weekly Individual Progress Report (W.I.P.R.), pronounced "whipper." At the end of each week the teacher recorded how many pages each child had moved through his programmed readers. By analyzing the results of the W.I.P.R., the staff calculated the rate at which the entire class was moving through the materials and thereby determined how "effective" the teachers were. Those whose pupils showed the fastest rate of progress were deemed "effective."

8. The Follow Through Staff

The two centers of Follow Through support staff activity were at New Oraibi on the reservation and at the University of Kansas; the staff of the former we call the Implementers, and the latter the Developers.[7] New Oraibi ran the local day to day aspects of the program. It consisted of a director, assistant director, field coordinator, two staff trainers (those who were to help teachers implement the model), two data clerks, and a secretarial staff. In addition, each school had a parent coordinator who visisted parents to explain the program and who was to help train and supervise parents in the classroom.

The Developer staff made frequent consulting trips from Kansas since the program began (1968). District advisors, assigned by the sponsor, made "site visits" to observe and advise on program operations. From time to time, other various

---

[7] A term coined by Wax and Wax, 1968.

researchers and consultants visited the Hopi Reservation to provide consulting services. From the beginning, the goal of the Kansas support staff had been to decrease its involvement by turning over more and more responsibility for the program to the local office.

How Parents Feel About Follow Through

In January, 1972, three and one half years after the Follow Through Program was inaugurated on the reservation, we began interviewing Hopi parents about their reactions to it. We found that there were several factors that influenced most of the parents overall judgments about the program.

First, parents reacted to Follow Through on the basis of their own personal experienced with it rather than on strictly philosophical grounds. Those who had worked as aides in the program and who found it a pleasant experience favored it. Those who had unpleasant experiences, such as fights with other parents, gave critical evaluations.

The second major factor affecting parents' judgments about the program was what the attitudes of the teachers were at their local school towards the Follow Through Program. Where teachers were strongly supportive of the program, as at Oraibi, parents took a very positive view of it. In locations where teachers were openly and consistently critical of certain parts of the model, parents expressed similar criticisms. At Polacca several teachers were very critical of the Sullivan reading series, and these criticisms were repeated by the parents. Nowhere else did we hear such strong criticisms of the reading book. Because parents generally respected the teachers' professional judgments, they followed their lead in these matters. While we saw that the parents also deferred to the expertise of the Developers on occasion, nevertheless, if difference of opinions arose between teachers and the Developers, parents usually, perhaps out of loyalty, stood with the teacher.

Another factor affecting the parents' judgments of the program was the way they perceived the overall condition of the school and the nature of their own chidren's progress. If all appeared to be going well at school for their children, if the children were learning the basics and seemed generally happy, then parents supported the school and all of its programs. If the children were doing poorly or seemed unhappy, the parents became quite critical of the school and, because it was so visibly innovative, the Follow Through Program.

1. Parental Involvement

The most controversial aspect of the model in the

TABLE 3

"Are There Any Parts of the Follow Through Program That You Like?"

Responses	No.		%
	171	=	100
Likes it, nothing disliked, no objections	27		16
Parent Involvement	43		24
Tokens	7		4
Materials	9		5
A specific subject area	17		10
Reading	11		
Math	2		
Handwriting	4		
"What they are teaching"	11		7
OTHER:	11		7
Don't like anything	4		
Attention and praising	2		
Health Program	1		
Group instruction	1		
Reviewing	1		
Headstart	1		
No punishment	1		
Total Responses	125		73
Don't Know	34		20
"My child(ren) doing well, they are learning"	12		7

TABLE 4

"Are There Any Parts of the Follow Through Program That You Dislike?"

Responses	No.	%
	182	= 100
No dislikes, no objections	47	26
Some aspect of parent involvement	41	22
Parents rough, unfair, pushy, etc.	12	
Parents working have no education	11	
Gossiping	6	
Parents in same class with own child	2	
Too many parents in classroom	5	
Not rotating parents, favoritism, hiring those who didn't need it	5	
Tokens	31	17
Materials or how they are used	11	6
Field Trips	14	8
Teaching Hopi	6	3
OTHER:	13	8
A specific subject area	3	
No punishment	1	
Donating for parties	3	
Too many meetings	1	
Confusion over training and workshops	4	
Not using equipment	1	
Total Responses	163	90
Don't Know	19	10

parents' view was parental participation in the Follow Through classroom in the role of teacher aides. This issue drew the most reaction from the parents during our interviews, and we learned that parents were almost evenly divided for and against parental involvement in the classroom.

As with their opinions on the overall program, the parents reacted to this issue largely on personal grounds. If a mother and father had worked and had had a good experience with it or felt that their efforts had helped the children to learn, they spoke favorably of it. If they did not have a good experience working with the program, they opposed it. For example, several mothers complained that they had been subjected to gossip at the school and on that basis denounced the program.

> I wouldn't want to go back. All the aides are fighting and they just tear each other down. Some aides don't even say 'hello' or 'good morning' to each other and talk about all their problems at school. The kids hear them then and tell what is going on. (Moencopi, 3/10/72)

Clan and factional rivalries of various sorts also played a role in affecting parental judgments about parental involvement. If jobs were going to individuals that the respondent disapproved of, the entire idea was deplored. If community members that he admired were hired, his reactions were positive. A few parents expressed criticisms of the program because they were not hired as often as others and suspected that favoritism by the Policy Advisory Committee had influenced the selection of other parents. I found, however, no evidence that these accusations were valid.

In addition, parents considered the effect they thought parental involvement would have on the children. Those that felt the attention provided by extra personnel was beneficial endorsed parental involvement. Still others recognized that by working with children in the classroom they might be better able to help their own children at home.

> I think [I like] the part where they are giving parents a chance to work. They help our children where they need help. It gives the parents a chance to know what the children are doing. (Polacca, 2/10/72)

And finally, many parents needed and appreciated the extra income that working in Follow Through provided.

Opposition to parental involvement came mainly from those who had most thoroughly accepted the professional educators' definition of the school, that is, that education and teaching should be left to those who are trained in such matters.

> Those ladies are running all over the place and getting into trouble. Those kids won't learn anything from Hopi teachers. They just go to workshops for two weeks and then try to teach those kids—what can they learn at these workshops... Then there is all that gossip going on at the schools. The kids get it and bring it home. (Hotevilla, 4/17/72)
>
> * * * *
>
> I would say the part I don't like now is the parents going into work.
>
> Why?
>
> Well, I feel a person who is going to teach our children should be educated or have a high school diploma. They aren't really qualified. People say they work for money, not really for the kids. That is the way I feel about it. (Hotevilla, 4/8/72)
>
> * * * *
>
> Mothers with less education are pulling them [children] down. These kids are a lot smarter than we used to be, so I don't like those mothers teaching in the classrooms. You should screen mothers and find out who is eligible. (Polacca, 2/10/72)

Other objections stemmed from feelings that parents in the classroom gave too much help, causing dependence on aides.

> One thing I don't like there are too many parents working there and [they] should have parents that are really trained to do this kind of job. Parents should be put into classrooms only if they are going to work and parents who like to work with children. Seems like children are getting too much help and don't work on their own. Parents should be put into the classrooms who are able to speak English. (Shungopovi, 6/72)
>
> * * * *
>
> All those aides don't know what to do. Some of them don't have a grade school education. The kids know more than they do. (Moencopi, 3/10/72)

2. Tokens

One of the most persistent and vocal criticisms of the model that we heard was of the token economy. These criticisms were strongly voiced in P.T.A. meetings, P.A.C. meetings, and in private conversations. In the interviews, however, tokens were mentioned with much less frequency that we expected (see Table 4) although it was the aspect of the model mentioned second on the list of dislikes.

The most serious criticism of tokens was that they created within the children an expectation of rewarding which was brought home from school. (Actually, few disapproved of its use in school per se.)

> ...The only thing I don't like is the token system. A lot of people are complaining about it. They say it goes into the home with the children. They ask for something when their parents tell them to do something.
> (Moencopi, 3/72)

* * * *

> They [the Hopi] never give rewards to children. They do as they are expected to do. It is not good for them and they go to school to learn, not to get rewards. Praising is good for a kid and we praise them, but never give them anything. There's one thing they don't know...these kids know who gets tokens. It can really hurt a child if he doesn't get any or as much as the next kid. They talk about it after school and a kid who doesn't can get hurt. He might not want to go to school after that. (emphasis fieldworker)
> (Moencopi, 3/72)

* * * *

> The only thing I don't like is that token business. When they get home they want something. When I tell them to chop wood, they ask for money. (Hotevilla, 4/13/72)

In Hopi society, as in other kin-oriented societies, it was felt that the individual has obligations to his kin group. A person took these obligations for granted and would not necessarily expect to be rewarded.

Rosalie Wax and Robert Thomas have noted with reference to other American Indians the following:

> Indian friends tell us that they do not praise or reward their children for doing what is proper or right; they are expected to behave well, for this is 'natural' or 'normal.' Thus a 'good' Indian child reflects no special credit

on himself or on his parents. (Wax and Thomas in Bahr, Chadwick, and Day eds. 1972: 32)

3. Praise

Perhaps the most intriguing question in our minds when we approached parents about the Follow Through model was the reaction we might get about the system of praise used in connection with token-giving. Several teachers had told us that parents found it difficult to praise children, often lapsing into negative forms of interaction such as ridicule or shaming with the school children.

Previous literature on the Hopi also suggested that praising may not be a particularly effective technique to use with Hopi children. Laura Thompson (1950: 93) argued that attitudes against praising individuals were "strongly intrenched" in Hopi culture and she suggested that a teacher who did praise would soon be rendered ineffective. As Dorothy Eggan had pointed out (in Spindler 1963: 325), traditional Hopi socialization processes emphasized interdependence rather than independence. Praising the individual, then, violated the ethic of mutual harmony and interdependence.

Soloman Asch wrote about Hopi attitudes:

> All individuals must be treated alike; no one must be superior and no one must be inferior. The person who is praised or who praises himself is automatically subject to resentment and to criticism, the object of which is to bring him back into the slow, hard-plodding line of all Hopi...
>
> Most Hopi men refuse to be foremen on jobs which the government sponsors on the reservation. If they do, they are immediately accused of thinking they are better than others, and are continually badgered by disparaging remarks. For example, P., an able, hard-working fellow, excels on the job and is frequently given the position of foreman, which he accepts. He is very unpopular... A more telling bit of evidence is that they do not compare the importance of one another's work. A highly skilled stone-cutter is perfectly content to accept the same wages as an unskilled day laborer.
> (quoted in Dozier 1966: 28)

Given these comments by previous observers, we expected parents to indicate in some way their disapproval of praising in the Follow Through classroom. They did not,

at least not directly. Indeed, most direct comments dealing with praise were in support of it as a technique. Parents who mentioned praise felt "it encouraged them" or "helps them along." Several parents who specifically objected to tokens said praise was appropriate (see quote in section above on tokens).

It is hard to interpret these findings. One might conclude either that the other observers were wrong or that values had dramatically changed since the initial observations had been made. Perhaps too, since each and every child was praised, rather than any one child being singled out for praise, the harmony ethic had not been violated.

To date (1973) we have come to no conclusions on this point other than to suggest that the praising component of the model may have been one of those unarticulated aspects of the Follow Through Program parents say they did not understand (see next section).

4. General Reactions

Working with the statistics, it was difficult to draw any clear-cut conclusions about how the parents felt about the program beyond the questions of parental involvement and the token economy. Overall, our general interpretation of parental attitudes towards Follow Through included three basic components.

First, considered as a whole, parents were generally in favor of the Follow Through Program, or perhaps more accurately, most were not against it. Although many were critical of specific aspects of it, there was no movement to terminate it. (We might parenthetically add that when we did hear talk of terminating Follow Through at Polacca in January, 1972 a school administrator quickly pointed out that the program spent $750 per child on the reservation.)

The sentiment in favor of Follow Through was not out of loyalty to the Developers and Implementers or out of philosophical attachment to the model, but rather because the program had in three and a half years time become identified with the regular school program and routine. The parents' overall endorcement and acceptance of the school, therefore, carried over to the Follow Through Program.

Even though parents were generally favorable to Follow Through in a broad sense, there was a great deal of ambiguity about it in their minds. Most parents could identify certain parts of the program that they especially

liked or disliked, but the stronger impression we had was that few really had given the program much thought or that any considered it their responsibility to do so. When we asked how they might change the program, many seemed surprised by the question suggesting that their recommendations would not be taken seriously, even by themselves. One mother when asked "If you could change Follow Through in any way, would you change anything and,if so, how?" replied rather cryptically to the question with "I might, if I could." (Shipaulovi, 6/72)

Community Understanding of the Follow Through Program

The most outstanding aspect of the parents' reactions to Follow Through was their own interpretation of their understanding of the program. Most parents of children in the program said they did not understand what it was all about (see Table 5). Most had heard of it, and a majority had at one time or another worked in it, but most said they did not understand why the program was set up, why it operated as it did, and what the concepts were behind it.

> Fieldworker: Do you know what the Follow Through Program is?
> Father: No, I don't know what it is. I don't understand it, but I heard about it. We don't know who sponsors it and don't know who to contact about it. (Polacca, 2/10/72)
> * * * *
>
> (same question asked)
> Mother: Not too good, not what it really means or the idea [of] what's really behind it. (emphasis hers) (New Oraibi, 5/72)
> * * * *
>
> (same question asked)
> Mother: No, we don't understand the program, but we know we have one [child] in the program. (Shungopovi, 8/72)
> * * * *
>
> Mother: I've heard of it but don't really understand it.
> Fieldworker: What don't you understand?
> Mother: Just what they do on these programs or what their purposes are. (Hotevilla, 4/17/72)

There were several reasons for this failure to "understand" the "purpose" and the "idea" behind the program. First, as we have seen, Hopis made a distinction between those institutions they considered to be "theirs" and those that belonged to someone else. Although the Follow Through Program technically "belonged" to the community, the

TABLE 5

"Do You Know What the Follow Through Program Is?" or
"Do You Understand What It Is About?"

Responses	No.		%
	155	=	100
Don't Know what it is	59		38
Heard of it, but don't understand it	27		17
A little	11		7
Not really	10		6
Think so	5		3
Yes, I know what it is	39		25
I was told about it	2		1
Just beginning to know	1		
All I know is that it includes parents	1		
Total Responses	155		100

community perceived it as another "White man's" project. As a result, many parents did not feel that it was their responsibility to understand it. They might have worked in it, they might have approved of it in a general sense, but they generally did not see it as "theirs" in the sense it was something that had originated in the Hopi community and which they could meaningfully affect.

This view was reflected in a conversation we had with a Hopi Implementer in his home:

> I asked if the program was in his opinion helping the parents to get involved in the school and the kind of education their children have. He said not really because the parents don't understand a lot of things and are afraid to speak up and contradict the teachers who they feel must know the job. He said that even in P.T.A. meetings they were afraid to say much because the teachers might say they are wrong and have them fired [?]. I asked him if the parents had thought much about what they want the schools to do. He said no, it [the school] was something they took for granted, something that had always been there, imposed on them, and they just accepted it; they really never gave much thought about it. 'All they really care about are the grades?' I ventured. 'So you're not too optimistic about the success of the program (in the near future" in respect to bringing the parents into real involvement with the policy-making of the schools?' 'No,' he said. 'I don't think it will. All they're interested in right now is the green stuff!' (Fieldnotes, 4/11/71)

Secondly, parents said they do not understand the program because it had not been explained to them in Hopi terms.

> Mother(who had worked with Follow Through two years): They try to explain it to us, but we still don't understand it. The people from Oraibi Hopi Action office use words hard for us to understand... We [teachers and parent aides?] had staff meeting and they [Follow Through staff] tried to explain it. They asked if it could b explained in Hopi, but they've never done anything about it. It's the trouble with the people; they don't understand it so they don't want to go to meetings. (Polacca, 2/72)
>
> * * * *
>
> Mother: The Follow Through Program has helped my children a lot. It helped them to read and make out his own word sounds. I

worked as a parent aide since it started but I don't understand what it is. I would like to have it explained to us what it really means. It is explained time after time. There are some things I don't nnderstand.

Fieldworker: What?

Mother: Where it came from and why we have it. They use a lot of words that I don't understand. (Polacca, 2/9/72)

* * * *

Mother(who was a P.A.C. representative): Parents should give their opinions. They go round and round about much, but if they understood more maybe they could decide better. Maybe they don't understand because of the hard language and long words; they are afraid to ask what these things mean. Those who know English well laugh at those who don't understand. We used to have large crowds at P.T.A. but now there aren't many. When they ask for information and are given explanations in Hopi, there are still words that are used in English like 'positive reinforcement' and these terms are not explained in Hopi. (Polacca, 2/14/72)

Frontiers and Definitions

The implementation of the model brought parents into interaction with Developers and Implementers at parent workshops and P.T.A. meetings where the program was "explained." To these frontiers both parties brought their definitions of the situation and each other.

Parents came into the school out of a history of exclusion from the formal education process and out of situations where they had been placed in subordinate relationships to professional educators and other various educational experts. As a result of these kinds of interactions in the institutional context, many parents saw themselves as lacking the knowledge, expertise, or power to affect educational decisions.

At the school, in workshops, at P.T.A. and P.A.C. meetings (see further discussion below), they confronted idealistic, assured, and eager "educational technologists" who wanted to advise and help parents run their schools. The Developers and Implementers saw themselves as possessing the best possible method of education for Hopi children and assumed parents would recognize this too. At these meetings, then, parents heard a plethora of terms such as "behavior modification (written by one mother as "behavior morotification")," "contingency contracting," "positive reinforcement,"

"back ups," "time out" and "on task." The actions, indeed the very assuredness of the Developers and Implementers, had an unintended symbolic meaning to the parents.

The Developers and Implementers gave the impression of being experts in a mysterious process, and, again as a result of this, some parents were impressed with their own sense of inadequacy rather than feeling they had something meaningful to contribute. This situation had been aggravated from time to time by the nature of the interactions at those meetings where parents had ventured criticisms of the program.

> ...The discussion then turned to tokens. Roger Henry said that 'if it was left to the kids, they would eliminate the token economy.' They [the kids]'would eliminate the token economy. They are not impressed with tokens and they would not use them if they had their way...'
>
> Miss Robin (from the University of Kansas) said she just wanted to point out one thing--she knew that there was a lot of criticism of tokens, but there was one class she visited before Christmas and 85% of the kids were working 'on task (this means they were working)' She then went back after Christmas and there were a very low number of children 'on task.' They were playing around, throwing erasers, etc. 'Now!' she said, 'that class had been taken off tokens all of a sudden and that was an example of what could happen if you did away with tokens too quickly.'
>
> The discussion in opposition of tokens ended.
> (Fieldnotes, 1/24/72)

In this encounter (and others observed) there was a pattern of interaction which had the effect of stifling attempts by parents to become involved in decisions affecting their children's educational processes.

When parents did express themselves by making critical evaluations of the Follow Through Program, the staff often reacted defensively and countered with a show of their "data" which supported their interpretation of how the program should have been run. This in turn silenced the parents who did not wish to appear obtuse by challenging the "data" and the program experts.

Most protesting parents, when confronted by the data and technical jargon, retreated from the encounter rather

than appear incapable of understanding that which seemed so obvious to the Follow Through staff. There was also a feeling on the part of some parents that to keep protesting would have been impolite and that the matter should rest rather than to have a confrontation with the outsiders.

Community Involvement in the Schools: The Policy Advisory Committee

Despite the efforts of the Follow Through and Hopi Action directors and the Policy Advisory Committee (P.A.C.) chairmen of the first three years, the P.A.C. had been an ineffective institution in terms of bringing control of the educational processes to the Hopi community.

The P.A.C. was a decision-making body whose very existence was specified in the Follow Through Guidelines and was established to fulfill guidelines requirements. It was not an organization that had roots in the Hopi communities or which reflected their political or social realities.

> In Miss J's class, I talked with Mrs. V. She was a parent aide for that classroom. She too told me of much confusion in her village over what Follow Through was all about, especially in regard to the P.A.C. She said the people did not know what the P.A.C. was all about. She complained of how at one P.T.A. meeting someone said that they had to elect a P.A.C. representative to attend a P.A.C. meeting that very night. 'What is the P.A.C.?' they all asked. No one could answer the question. All they knew was that they had to elect a representative. 'So we did!' (Fieldnotes, 9/7/70)

When parents arrived at P.A.C. meetings, they faced a pre-planned agenda of things they must consider or approve. Most P.A.C. decisions to the date of this study had been on procedural or personnel matters. Virtually no decisions of an educational nature had been made by the P.A.C.

Although P.A.C. meetings could last for several hours (and usually did), most discussions were not initiated by P.A.C. members but by Follow Through staff members or consultants. Normally, the procedure was for the P.A.C. to react to proposals and it never rejected those advanced by the staff. Then, because of a high turn over of P.A.C. members,many meetings had been given over to explanations of P.A.C. functions or the Follow Through Program itself.

In its early stages just after the Follow Through Program began, P.A.C. meetings were often dominated by ex-

officio members such as principals, administrators, or university consultants. On several occasions, we observed P.A.C. meetings developing into a scene of heated debates between a principal and Follow Through staff members with P.A.C. members unwilling or unable to make comment.

Many meetings were incomprehensible to P.A.C. members. A former P.A.C. member related the following: "I went down there, and they used all these hard words; I didn't know what they were talking about." (5/10/72) Many members had resigned as they felt that either the P.A.C. was ineffective or that the time they contributed was worthwhile.

Perhaps the most serious problem for the P.A.C. was its lack of recognition in the communities. Over half of the parents said they had not heard of the P.A.C., and those who had heard of it had only a vague understanding of what it did or what it was supposed to do (see Table 5, p. 51). Thus, there has been a lack of interest in the P.A.C., and, in consequence, spring meetings have failed for a lack of quorum.

Another serious problem with the P.A.C. (unrecognized by the Follow Through staff) was that the concept of a representative committee was not compatible with Hopi thinking. In the traditional scheme, decisions were made by religious leaders who, as pointed out above, were entrusted with decisions by virtue of their ceremonial knowledge. In other matters, decisions were made by consensus. When the P.A.C. was organized, villagers were sent to represent and make decisions for an entire area. This obligation was almost impossible for many P.A.C. members as they were simply reluctant to say or do anything in the name of the community. Many decisions had been delayed while P.A.C. members consulted with their communities for approval of a proposal.

Hopis were also not accustomed to making decisions by committee. Many village decisions were made less formally and, again, by consensus rather than democratic vote. A Hopi principal argued that no decisions could be expected from committees.

> I just go ahead and do things andif the community doesn't like it, I'll hear about it soon enough and act accordingly.
> (6/2/73)

TABLE 6

"Do You Know What the P.A.C. Is?"

Responses	No.	%
	176	= 100
No, Don't Know what it is, don't understand	97	55
Heard of it, but don't know what they do	18	10
Yes, or thinks so	33	19
Representatives from school/community	10	6
They hire parents as aides	5	3
They help better the program/school	5	3
OTHER:	8	5
They meet to discuss things	3	
We present our problems to them	2	
They help parent aides	1	
They direct the program	1	
They plan field trips	1	
Total Responses	176	100

CONCLUSIONS

If the Hopi Follow Through Program is to be evaluated adequately, it must be considered from two perspectives.

From the first perspective, it may simply be viewed as a program of directed change with the University of Kansas serving as the sponsor and the Hopi Tribe as client. In this situation, the program is designed by the sponsor to modify the traditional procedures of the B.I.A. school system. The sponsor introduces a new model of education into the classroom and places parents into teaching positions.

With this perspective, the Behavior Analysis Follow Through sponsor has accomplished the basic objectives on the Hopi reservation. By 1972 themodel was implemented in all reservation classrooms through the third grade. Although this model of education met the resistence of many teachers and its execution was often piecemeal and disjointed, the model did bring a sizable number of parents into the classroom and it did bring about major changes in the curriculum and classroom organization.

Indeed, with the advent of this particular model for Follow Through, large numbers of parents entered into the reservation school system as teacher aides, for the model required four teachers per classroom (as described earlier). Even though not all of the parental involvement had been due to Follow Through, it had by far brought the greatest number of parents into the school. More significantly, it had put them in the role as teachers where they themselves could see how the school functioned. There were two important concepts implied by these facts:

1) Parents had a right to be involved in the school program and its classroom processes, and

2) Parents were considered competent enough to engage in actual teaching tasks.

The Follow Through Program also created among the parents an expectation of involvement. Parental participation in the classroom, though controversial, became part of the school routine to the extent that parents could assume that there would be employment opportunities available on a regular basis.

In addition, the Follow Through Program also provided the Hopi schools the kind of academic program that parents

said they wanted. That is, this model strongly emphasized the "basic skills," including reading (of English), handwriting, and mathematics. To this extent then, the goals of the Follow Through Program articulated with those that the parents had for their children in school.

Within the context just discussed (Sponsor-Client relationship), the Follow Through Program may be viewed as basically successful as a program of directed change, providing the services of the sponsor (Kansas Follow Through) to a willing client, the Hopi Tribe. If, however, the program is viewed as a program designed to alter the basic interrelationship between community and school (the second perspective), to create a community-controlled and community-oriented school program via the P.A.C. and parental participation, it has failed.

While the program had brought parents into the school and altered some of the basic features of the classroom, the same basic patterns of interrelationships in the school, viewed as a frontier, have remained. Here we found the central paradox of the program, for Follow Through while attempting to encourage and nurture community involvement and control of the school processes, was at the same time attempting to accomplish those ends via a model of education most parents said they simply did not understand.

The contractual obligations that the sponsor had made with the Office of Education to implement the model was then in conflict with the concept that the Hopi community should develop and direct their own educational programs. Although the Hopi communities basically supported the implementation of the Behavior Analysis model for Follow Through in their schools, there was a lack of control on their part in the fundamental decision-making processes related to the development of the program.

It is important here to make a distinction between community involvement and community control. In Hopi schools today, parents are involved but not in control. Nor has there been any demand on their part that they should control schools. As we have described in earlier sections, Hopi parents saw the schools as Anglo institutions which should be controlled by those versed in the rituals of the schools.[8]

---

[8]When a Hopi educator read a draft of this section, he suggested I write "...institutions which should be controlled by Anglos versed in the rituals of the school." He suggested this, for he felt that his own ideas as a Hopi educator were not considered credible because he was not an Anglo.

The Follow Through Program as of this writing has not served as a particularly effective vehicle for changing this definition of the situation. For while parents were totally involved in the implementation of the model, they contributed nothing nor had been asked to contribute anything to the model's development. The parents had only been asked to make decisions on how it could be implemented.

The Developers of the model in this situation were caught between two principles: They felt an obligation to see that the model was implemented as much as possible in accordance with the way it was laid out, and, on the other hand, they were sympathetic with the community and wanted the community to take upon itself a greater role in the decision-making processes. In the best of all possible worlds, in their view, the community would recognize the superiority of their educational approach and exercise community control by implementing the model as it was designed. When the community did not define the situation this way, the Follow Through staff became exasperated.

As we have indicated, the Developers saw themselves as behavioral scientists and educational technologists who, as the result of their particular style of research, had discovered the most effective way to teach children, or, in a more general sense, to "modify behavior." They believed that the research supporting their model was based upon the only valid social science methodology, which provided them with a strategy of education universally applicable, and, this, if used properly, would insure faster and better learning by school students. Supporting their belief in their model was the "data" or the information about the learning rates and accomplishments of the children. As a result, they promoted their model as one might proselytize a new religion. In fact, one principal, recognizing the similarity, referred to the Developers as "missionaries."

The dedication of the Developers to their model created a basic conflict of interest in relation to the development of community control. In the eyes of the Developers the key element in the implementation of the program was the model itself. The model had been placed in the Hopi classroom without any cross-cultural modification because it was perceived by the Follow Through staff as a way to solve most of the problems of educational motivation and achievement. Indeed, the model embodied techniques based upon what they considered to be fundamental principles of human behavior and which enabled them to talk of the "technology of education."

Given this perception of the situation by the Follow Through staff, the program took on a unidirectional

character and staff efforts were channeled into selling the model rather than working with the community to develop educational concepts it understood. In this respect, the structure of the interaction between the Follow Through organization and the Hopi community was not unlike that between the early missionaries and the Hopi (Breunig 1973).

The missionaries had an educational program that they felt was "good" for the Hopis and for which they sought converts. So too, the Follow Through behavioral technologists were the new missionaries, seeking converts not for Christianity, but for their concept of education. In both cases, non-Hopis had defined what would be best for the Hopi community in terms of the school and had implemented their projects in an effort to sell their ideals. In other words, the effort to implement the model as is, was in direct conflict to the notion that the community should develop its own concepts of education and control the schools.

Lest I appear too critical of the Follow Through Program and its Developers and Implementers, it should be pointed out that they were invited into the reservation in 1968 by the Hopi Tribal Council after the model was selected at a reservation-wide P.T.A. meeting. In this respect, of course, the program differs from former change programs on the reservation. The Tribe sought out the program on the advice of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and, we are told, the major factor influencing the selection of this model was the employment opportunities it offered the parents.

Nevertheless, because the program was placed into the schools pre-planned and pre-packaged, it was again impressed upon the parents that the answers to their educational problem would continue to be solved by methods and techniques innovated from outside their communities by Anglos rather than from within their communities themselves. Despite whatever educational gains that Hopi children may have achieved from the model, the program has not served to instill within the parents a changed definition of the school or their role in it.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We are reluctant to make recommendations for the thrust of this report is this: If it is the goal of the federal government to encourage community involvement in and control of schools serving Hopi children, this involvement and control should evolve through programs originating from the Hopi communities themselves.

Perhaps the greatest educational need in our view is not that Hopi children learn more skills faster, but that the Hopi people develop confidence in themselves and their educational leaders in order to develop a school program that is comprehensible to the parents and is consistent with Hopi values.

If any lesson is to be learned from the Hopi Follow Through Program, it is that programs and models implemented from outside the Hopi communities can, quite inadvertantly, perpetuate the notion on the part of the parents that they are essentially powerless or incompetent with regard to educational affairs. We wish to note here that the particular model that has been implemented from Kansas University is not the major issue here. Rather, it is the entire structure of the relationship between the Developers and Implementers of the program and the parents who participate in it.

We, therefore, suggest that in future programs that there be less emphasis on a model, particularly those developed from outside the community, with parents being asked to implement that model. Instead, more emphasis should be placed on encouraging Hopi parents to participate in planning and directing their own educational programs. As an alternative approach, we would suggest that the Office of Education directly allocate funds to the Hopi Tribe for innovative educational projects which are developed by Hopi educators and thinkers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Asch, S.E.
Personality Development of Hopi Children. Reported in Hano, Edward P. Dozier, 1966. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Bahr, Howard M., Chadwick, Bruce, A., and Day, Robert C., eds.
1972. Native Americans Today: Sociological Perspectives. New York: Harper & Row, Pub.

Barnett, Homer.
1953. Innovation: The Basis of Change. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.

Beaglehole, E. and P.
1935. Hopi of the Second Mesa. Memoirs of the American Anthropological Assoc. 44: 1-65.

Blumer, Herbert.
1969. Symbolic Interactionism. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bohannan, Paul and Plog, Fred.
1967. Beyond the Frontier: Social Process and Culture Change. American Museum Sourcebooks in Anthropology.

Brandt, Richard.
1945. Hopi Ethics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Breunig, Robert G.
1973. Hopi Perspectives on Formal Education. Unpublished dissertation.

Breunig, Robert G.
1970-1972. Field Notes. Hopi Indian Reservation.

Burgess, Robert L. and Bushell, Don, Jr.
1969. Behavior Sociology: The Experimental Analysis of Social Process. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bushell, Don, Jr. and Associates
1971. The Behavior Analysis Classroom. Lawrence, Kansas.

Collier, John Jr.
1973. Alaskan Eskimo Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.

Cushing, F. H. et al.
1922. Contributions to Hopi History. American Anthropologist, Vol. 24, No. 3.

Deloria, Vine, Jr.
1969. Custer Died For Your Sins. London: The Macmillan Company.

Dennis, Wayne.
1940. The Hopi Child. New York: Appleton-Century Co.

Department of the Interior.
1871-1896. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

1906. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Dockstader, Frederick J..
1954. The Kachina and the White Man. Bloomfield Hills, Michigan: Cranbrook Institute of Science.

Donaldson, Thomas.
1893. Moqui Pueblo Indians of Arizona and Pueblo Indians of New Mexico. Washington, D.C.: United States Census Printing Office.

Dorsey, George A. and Voth, H.R.
1901. The Oraibi Soyal Ceremony. Publications of the Field Columbian Museum, Vol. III, March, 1901.

Dozier, Edward P.
1966. Hano: A Tewa Indian Community in Arizona. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

1970. The Pueblo Indians of North America. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.

Dumont, Robert V., Jr. and Wax, Murray L.
1969. Cherokee School Society and the Intercultural Classroom. Human Organization, Vol. 28, No. 3.

Eggan, Dorothy.
1956. Instruction and Affect in Hopi Cultural Continuity. Southwestern Journal.of Anthropology, Vol. 12, No. 4, 347-370.

Eggan, Fred.
1950. Social Organization of the Western Pueblos. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fey, Harold and McNickle, D'Arcy.
1970. Indians and Other Americans. New York and Evanston: Perennial Library.

Foster, George.
1969. Applied Anthropology. Boston: Little Brown and Company.

Gans, Herbert J.
1962. The Urban Villagers. New York: The Free Press.

Goffman, Erving.
1959. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

1967. Interaction Ritual. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Hack, John.
1942. The Changing Physical Environment of the Hopi Indians. Papers of the Peabody Museum. Vol. 35, No. 1.

Hagan, William T.
1961. American Indians. Chicago; University of Chicago Press.

Hopi Tribal Council
1969. Hopi Demographic Survey by B.I.A. Oraibi.

1970. Hopi Tribal Council Report. Oraibi.

Hughes, Everett C.
1971. The Sociological Eye, Vol. I. Chicago: Aldine and Co.

Hughes and Hughes
1952. Where Peoples Meet. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Josephy, Alvin M.
1971. Red Power. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

King, A. Richard
1967. The School At Mopass: A Problem of Identity. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Levine, Stuart, Ed.
1965. The American Indian Today. Midcontinent American Studies Journal (fall).

Linton, Ralph.
1940. Acculturation in Seven American Indian Tribes. New York and London: Appleton-Century Co.

Lummis, Charles F.
1968. Bullying the Moqui, edited by Robert Easton and Mackenzie Brown. Prescott, Arizona: Prescott College Press.

McFee, Malcolm.
The 150% Man, A Product of Blackfeet Acculturation. Reported in Native Americans Today, Bahr, Chadwick, and Day, eds. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

McKinley, Francis, Bayne, Stephen, and Nimnicht, Glen, eds
1970. Who Should Control Indian Education? Berkeley, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Mead, George H.
1962. Mind, Self, and Society, edited by Charles W Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1964. George Herbert Mead on Social Psychology, edited by Anselm Strauss. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Montgomery, R.G., Smith, Watson, and Brew, J.O.
1949. Franciscan Awatovi: Reports of the Awatovi Expedition: Report 3. Cambridge: Peabody Museum.

Nequatewa, Edmund.
1967. Truth of a Hopi. Flagstaff: Museum of Northern Arizona.

Office of Education, United States
1969. Follow Through Program Manual (Guidelines). Washington, D.C.

Oswalt, Wendell.
1966. This Land Was Theirs. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Park, Robert E.
1950. Race and Culture. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

1967. On Social Control and Collective Behavior, edited by Ralph H. Turner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Parsons, Elsie Clews.
1939. Pueblo Indian Religion, Vol. 2. Chicago.

Parsons, Elsie Clews, et al.
1922. Contributions to Hopi History. American Anthropologist, Vol. 24, No. 3.

Redfield, Robert.
1967. The Little Community, Peasant Society and Culture. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Roessel, Robert.
1968. Statement at Hearings of Subcommittee on Indian Education, U.S. Senate, Part 1, pp. 12-14. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Sekaquaptewa, Helen.
1969. Me and Mine, edited by Louise Udall. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Siegal, B.S. and Beals, A.R.
1960. Pervasive factionalism. American Anthropologist, Vol. 62, No. 3, 394-417.

Skinner, B.F.
1953. Science and Human Behavior. New York: The Free Press.

Spicer, Edward.
1961. Perspectives in American Indian Culture Change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1962. Cycles of Conquest. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

1969. A Short History of the Indians of the United States. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.

Spindler, George, ed.
1963. Education and Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Striner, Herbert E.
1968. A Program for the Training, Employment, and Economic Equality of the American Indian, unpublished paper, p. 27. Washington, D.C.: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Talayesva, Don.
1942. Sun Chief, edited by Leo W. Simmons. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Thomas, A.B.
1932. Forgotten Frontier: A Study of Spanish Indian Policy, 1777-1787. Norman, Oklahoma.

Thompson, Laura.
1950. Culture in Crisis. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Thompson, Laura and Joseph, Alice.
1944. The Hopi Way. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Titiev, Mischa.
1944. Old Oraibi, A Study of the Hopi Indians of Third Mesa. Cambridge, Mass.: Papers of Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. 22, No. 1.

1972. The Hopi Indians of Old Oraibi. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

United States Bureau of the Census
1930. Indian Population of the United States and Alaska. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States Senate.
1969. Indian Education: A National Tragedy, A National Challenge. Report of Special Subcommittee on Indian Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

1972. Authorize Partition of Surface Rights of Navaho-Hopi Indian Land. Hearings before the Committee on Indian Affairs on H.R. 1128. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Waters, Frank and Fredericks, Oswald.
1963. The Book of the Hopi. New York: Ballantine Books.

Wax, Murray L.
1971. Indian Americans: Unity and Diversity. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

1972. Cultural Pluralism, Political Power, and Ethnic Studies, in manuscript.

Wax, Murray and Wax, Rosalie
1968. The Enemies of the People. The Institution and the Person. Chicago: Aldine and Co.

1971. Great Tradition, Little Tradition, and Formal Education. Reported in Anthropological Perspectives on Education, Wax, Diamond, and Gearing, Eds. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Wax, Murray, Diamond, Stanley, and Gearing, Fred O., eds.
1971. Anthropological Perspectives on Education. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Wax, Murray L., Wax, Rosalie, H., and Dumont, Robert V., Jr.
1964. Formal Education in an American Indian Community. Social Problems, Vol. 11, No. 4.

Wax, Rosalie H.
1967. The Warrior Dropouts. Reported in Native Americans Today, Bahr, Chadwick, and Day, eds. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

1971. Doing Fieldwork: Warnings and Advice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wax, Rosalie H. and Thomas, Robert K.
1961. American Indians and White People. Reported in Native Americans Today, Bahr, Chadwick, and Day, eds. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Wax, Rosalie and Wax, Murray
The Magical World View, in manuscript.

White, Elizabeth Q.
1964. No Turning Back, edited by Vada F. Carlson. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Wolcott, Harry F.
1967. A Kwakiutl Village and School. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.